

459.

A N

1593000
147000
1446000

A N S W E R

TO THE

200000
1446000
554000

B U D G E T.

INSCRIBED TO

The C O T E R I E.

3/522000/174
22
21
12

696000

L O N D O N:

Printed for E. SUMPTER, in Fleet-Street. 1764.

(Price ONE SHILLING.)

174000
174
348000
174
522

440000000/3500000
140000000
20
20

3/4 3

522000
3
4/1566000/391500
12
36

3/5 = 348000.
391500

ANISWER

TO THE

BUDGET

DESCRIBED TO



ERIE

The

LONDON:

Printed by W. G. & Co. in Great Britain

THE ONE SHILLING

1861

1861



People join the Fashion (for they would not be out of the
 Fashion for ever so much) without knowing for why or where
 fore; but only because it is the voice of a **MAN** and they will
 not deviate from their **AN**... Had not their People
 much better mind their Business, and let State Affairs alone?
 What are State Affairs to them? State Affairs will not get them
 a Dinner when they want it. But it seems to be the Evil Gen-
 eral of this Country, every Man a Politician: Every
 Man a City Shop-keeper and Cobbler is to be a Ministry to
 the State, to examine the Conduct of Ministers, call Names
 out, or with him Things are not write. Unless some Method be
 taken that shall effectually put a Stop to this increasing Licentious
 Practice, it will be next to impossible to carry on the public Bu-
 siness. I am convinced that is the sense of all those who love
 and wish well to his Majesty's present Government.

AN SWER TO THE BUDGET, &c.

* For the Benefit of their Ignorance, I will place here a short Explanation of
 what is understood by the Word Budget, in the Sense. When the House of
 Commons have voted the Supply, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, at the
 close of the Session, opens to the House, in a Speech, what are to be



IT is amazing how a Pamphlet so absurd and ill-
 written, as **THE BUDGET** is universally acknow-
 ledged to be, should be favoured with so general
 a Reception: So general, that in almost every
 Company the first Question is—*Have you seen the*
BUDGET? And this is so *mechanically* demanded, that not above
 one Man in a hundred understands what is meant by the Word

B **BUDGET.**

BUDGET *. But it is the Fashion to abuse and decry those whom his Majesty has thought proper to appoint his Servants for the Execution of the public Business, and these ignorant People join the Fashion, (for they would not be out of the Fashion for ever so much) without knowing for why or wherefore; but only because it is the voice of a *Mob*, and they will not deviate from their Fellow Subjects. Had not these People much better mind their Business, and let *State Affairs* alone? What are *State Affairs* to them? *State Affairs* will not get them a Dinner when they want it. But it seems to be the Evil Genius of this Country, that every Man is a Politician: Every ignorant City Shop-keeper and Cobler is to be at Liberty to *watch the State*, scrutinize the Conduct of Ministers, call Names, &c. or with him Things are not write. Unless some Method is taken that shall effectually put a Stop to this increasing licentious Practice, it will be next to impossible to carry on the public Business. I am confident this is the Sense of all those who serve in and wish well to his Majesty's *present* Government.

* For the Benefit of these Ignoramus's, I will place here a short Explanation of what is understood by the Word **BUDGET**, in this Sense: When the House of Commons have voted the *Supplies*, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, towards the latter End of the Sessions, opens to the House, in a Speech, what are to be the *Ways and Means* for raising the Money granted by the *Supplies*: This Speech, in the Parliamentary Language, is called, *The opening of the BUDGET*. Mr. Grenville's Speech, towards the Close of the last Session of Parliament, was so universally admired and applauded, that the Minority, stuck to the Quick by the Lustre and Superiority of his Abilities, set all their Wits to Work to render him Ridiculous and Odious to the Public, after they had failed to do it in Parliament: Accordingly out came **THE BUDGET**, which is nothing more or less than an impotent, malevolent, Attack upon his Speech.

The

The Writer of the **BUDGET** says, That the Ministry published an account of the Supplies and Ways and Means, in the common News Papers, with a View of gaining a little Applause from the People.

Now this (the first of the many pretended Facts) is nothing less than an absolute and audacious *Falsity*. For I can take upon me to affirm, that the Motive for stating of that extraordinary Account before the Public, was not to gain Applause, but to give **RIGHT INFORMATION**: To prevent artful and designing Men, who have no other Views but disturbing the Peace and Repose of his Majesty's faithful Servants, from obstructing the ordinary Course of executing the public Business. The Administration are *above* courting Applause by any such Means; nor do I believe they are solicitous, whether they have it, or not, from such as usually *con* over News Papers. With such Men as the *Opposition*, (who, as they are not wanting for Talents, are the more dangerous to a State, and to a People whom they are every Day endeavouring to delude and draw off from their Allegiance to the best of Princes, and the mildest of Governments) every little Act of the Administration is magnified into a mountainous Bulk; and however harmless or honest may have been its Tendency, it is falsely and malignantly construed otherwise, in Order to make the People believe they are Enemies to Liberty, (though nothing is more certain, than that they are its best and truest Friends; for they offered to bring a Bill into the House of Commons, to fix the Boundaries of Liberty) and the Interests of the Kingdom (though they provide for its Happiness and Security, without any new Burdens). For, having done this, the only able and capable Minister, with which this
Country

Country was ever blessed, is stiled (in Page 5.) *our very laborious Chancellor of the Exchequer*. I can easily see why he is *honoured* with the Epithet *laborious*; (for an Honour it is, and I am sure he thinks so) it is because he is diligent and indefatigable in Business; because he will not suffer the important Concerns of the Public to be interrupted by any Set of noisy gambling Vifitants, or insolent officious Strangers; because he holds up the Dignity of himself and his Office in a Manner unexampled. Such a Minister, although *Virtue* be his Foundation, and *Wisdom* his Resource, will nevertheless have his Enemies: But then it must be remembered, that having been appointed by the King, in Preference to all other Men, and acting not with any View of Gain to himself, but only for the Honour of his Master, and the Interest of the Nation, they are Enemies also to both their King and Country.

After treating so good and able a Minister, whom his Majesty has been pleased to make choice of, with a malicious envious Sneer of Contempt, by quibbling about the $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Farthing, he brings in that corrupt old Whig, Sir ROBERT WALPOLE, who, he says, reduced the Interest of the National Debt, so as to get a Sinking Fund which produced 20,000,000 l. but he does not add what Sir Robert did with this Sum: And I believe he cannot deny, that his favourite Veteran in Corruption bribed the Parliament with it. What Service did his Sinking Fund therefore do the Nation? Was it not rather a Mischief? Mr. PELHAM is next introduced as a Financier: I wonder Mr. LEGGE was not also brought in Head and Shoulders; he is, in the Language of the Minority, *the most accomplished Financier in Europe*: but I had forgot, he is in a declining State at Canonbury-

bury-house at *Islington*.—I suppose, sick of the Mortification and Disappointments of his Party.

But the Author of *THE BUDGET* says, no Minister can pay any Part of the National Debt, unless he either improves the Revenue (*i. e.* lays new Taxes) or lessens the Interest of the Debt. Now that that is a Falstiy, calculated only to deceive the People, and injure the Reputation of his Majesty's Government, there needs no other Fact than this to prove; above 2,771,867 l. " of the *unfortunate* Debt contracted during the late War," (I repeat the Words of the Minister, because I think they do him Honour) has been paid this Year, without either laying new Taxes, or reducing the Interest of the Debt. It is true, the Author of *THE BUDGET* will not allow this whole Sum to be appropriated to the Discharge of *Debts*; but affirms, that some of the Articles, which he enumerates, are provided for as they arise: In this, however, he will find himself mistaken, if he enquires a little farther into the Matter.

His Criticism on the Establishment of the Army deserves no other Notice than, that it is a Parcel of Nonsense, utterly unintelligible and false in the only Fact that is pretended to be advanced; which is, that the Administration have concluded a Peace that is *hollow, and unlikely to be permanent*. There is not a Man in the three Kingdoms but that can, if he pleases, give the Lye to this Assertion. It is now above a Year and a Half since the Peace was concluded; and has any one Circumstance occurred to prove the Peace hollow? The Writer of *THE BUDGET* cannot bring one? And the very friendly Correspondence, and good Understanding at this Time subsisting between the Courts of *France* and

England, is a stronger Proof of the Peace being likely to be *permanent*, than any Thing the Writer of THE BUDGET can bring to the contrary.

The strict Union, Cordiality, and Affection, between the Courts and the Ambassadors also, is *another* Proof that there is no Reason to suspect the Peace is not *permanent*, whatever artful, base, designing Men may report. Under the same Head, the Writer talks of *an Over-proportion of Officers*. I agree with him in the *Expression*, though not in the *Argument* in which he uses it, because nothing can be more malicious and false than that Argument is. It is true, that there is "An Over-proportion of *some* Officers;" FACTIOUS Officers, I mean, who, thinking themselves wholly *independent*, presume to oppose the Government of their Master, from whom they receive their daily Bread. Two of these his M——y, with a Spirit becoming a great K——, *who will think and act for himself*, has thought proper to dismiss. Upon the Dismissal of the first, he being a Member of Parliament, a Parliamentary Enquiry was threatened to be made into the Cause of his Dismissal: But upon second Thoughts, the Minority thought better of it: They were in no Humour to hazard a Trial of Strength upon a Question, which one single Assertion is at any Time sufficient to put a Negative upon. It was *his M——y's Pleasure*, that that Officer should be dismissed his Service; and who has a Right to demand more? Who is to controul M—— in the Exercise of the Royal Prerogative? As to the Dismissal of the *other* Officer, although it is no more than a Thing of Course, and what every Body might have expected; yet the Writers of the Minority have pompously represented it as an Invasion of National

tional Liberty, as an Attack upon the Constitution, forgetting, or rather wilfully neglecting, to state even any Part of that Conduct before the Public, which *caused* the Dismissal. I say *caused*; for, to the Honour of the Administration, they act with more *Openness* and *Spirit*, than their Predecessors, who, if an Officer disoblged them by his Conduct in Parliament, they were mean enough, and pitiful enough, to seek for another Flaw in his Conduct, and pretend to make *that* the Cause of his Dismissal, which certainly followed upon the first Moment of such Discovery.

The Writers for the present Administration, with a Spirit truly becoming Englishmen, of whom Openness is the Characteristic, do not lurk in bye Corners to watch for little Advantages, but publicly and honestly acknowledge, that the Dismissal of this latter Officer was for his Opposition to the Ministry. And I would ask his Friends, who know what he said upon a certain Occasion, Whether they expected he would be permitted to hold all, or any of his Employments, one Day longer than the Prorogation of Parliament? Whether, after having, as it were, *given Fire* to a Motion intended to asperse and distress his M——'s Government, that Government could think themselves safe, if they did not punish, in an exemplary Manner, such wanton and barefaced Violence? Whether former Ministers have not done the same with Respect to such Officers as voted against them in Parliament, although they have not had the Courage to acknowledge, that such Voting was the *real cause* of their Dismissal? Whether the Minister, when in Parliament he is endeavouring to execute in the most easy, secure and satisfactory Manner, his M——'s Business, has not, and ought not, to have the

the same Reason to expect, that all the Officers who sit in that Assembly, should vote with him upon all Occasions, they being still his M——'s Servants, as Lord *Granby*, when in the Field, expects that all the Officers under him should obey his *Orders* directly, and without any Kind of Murmur or Hesitation; and if any does not, he does not punish or complain of such as presume to disobey, as presume to know better than their Leader? Would not that Minister deserve to be branded as a *tame, cowardly* Wretch, that had not Spirit to advise the Chastisement of such *factious* Opposition? And would not that S——n be in a most miserable, unhappy, and distracted Situation, that durst not, that would be afraid to revenge such an Insult offered to his Government, by only a due Exertion of his Prerogative?—— Thank God, we have at length a K——, who knows *how* to be a K——, and who, in Order to make himself and his People happy, acts with a Soul that is truly noble, virtuous and great, and worthy of himself.

After cavilling about the Army Extraordinaries, which the Writer cannot, nor does not confute, he blunders on a Syllogism, which is just stark Nonsense, and on an Expression, which is a Proof of the Tyranny of his Principles, although he pretends to be a Friend to Liberty. He says, "That however constitutional a large Marine may be, yet we should run less Risk, if it was not so well provided for." Did ever Mortal hear such Jargon: Sure the Man is mad. How in the Name of Wonder shall we run less Risk, if we neglect providing for that which is our chief and only Security? There needs no Arguments to prove what is universally agreed, *viz.* That the Navy is the only Thing that makes our Country respectable: Would our
Country

Country then be respected, if that Navy was neglected? Peace, thou Sower of Sedition; and before thou begins to sow again, learn Logic.

After thus exposing his Ignorance, he pretends to justify himself, by saying, " That Sailors dismissed the public Service, do " continue Sailors in the Merchant Service, and are always " ready at Hand when a War breaks out." So then this wretched Advocate of the Minority would, in Case a War should break out, have the Government be reduced to that most wicked and iniquitous of all Measures, PRESSING. Is this a Proof of his Love of Liberty? Has not a poor Sailor in this Country, as much a Right to his Liberty, as the greatest Lord? And do they call themselves the Friends of Liberty, who would deprive even the meanest of his Majesty's Subjects, their Enjoyment of it? No, they are not; and for that Reason this contemptible Scribbler of theirs says, There is no Merit in employing the Sailors in the Smuggling Cutters, who might have been employed in the Merchants Service. And, in Order to cast an Odium on the Smuggling Business, he says, or insinuates as much, that it is what no meritorious Officer will chuse to be concerned in. What then, Are all the Lieutenants, who are put into the Command of the Smugglers, Officers without Merit? I fancy, if one of them was to meet the Writer of the BUDGET in the Street, he would convince him who had most Merit, as a Friend to his Country. In Order to aggravate this Matter, he relates, (in his own Style) that the Minister turned the deaf Ear to a Thousand Lieutenants, who solicited Six-pence *per Diem* to be added to their Half-Pay. The Request was unreasonable. When Gentlemen (if such
D these

these Lieutenants were) enter the Service, they know the Wages; if they do not like them, they need not enter. If the Coachman of any Nobleman or Gentleman should, after having drove him from one End of the Kingdom to the other, demand to raise his Wages in Consequence of such Service, which was no more than his Duty, and what he was hired to do, would the Gentleman be weak enough, and tame enough, to comply with such an insolent Demand? If the Minister had granted their Requests, he must have levied Money on the Subject, and if he had done that, though it should have been by the most easy and practicable Tax that ever was laid, the Opposition would have sworn through thick and thin, that the Minister was going to impoverish our Country.

With regard to the Smuggling Cutters, it may be Matter of Wonder to the rational intelligent Part of the Multitude, why the Minister is blamed for that. It is well known (not universally perhaps) that the Scheme is not his. Our Author, who seems so conversant in many private Anecdotes, doubtless knew this; but he would not confess it, lest he should thereby render the greatest Part of his Pamphlet of no Effect. A plain and undeniable Proof this, that the Minister *must* be attacked, deservedly or undeservedly, it matters not. But now the Truth comes out: The Scheme of the Smuggling Cutters was originally projected by the late Admiral *Smith*; and several Noblemen and Gentlemen well know what great Pains he took about it. The Administration to whom he proposed it, neither minding the Interest of their Country nor its honour, but devoting all their Attention to Turtle-eating, Feasting, and Gambling, contemptuously laughed at him as a Projector. So,
how-

however beneficial the Scheme may be to the Public (and of the utmost Benefit it has already been found) because the late Ministers refused it, and the present Ministers have adopted it, this Limb of the old Leaven must, for Conveniency's Sake, abuse and revile them for it. However, the Author proves nothing with all his Flourishes at figuring,——only that has not yet proved *quite* so beneficial as was thought. But who can affirm (not the Writer of the BUDGET, though I own he may, with just as much Reason and Foundation as he does many other things) that it will not, in Time, prove as beneficial as the most sanguine Friend of his Majesty's Administration can wish?——It is here the Author makes a Kind of Triumph, by asserting, that the late Improvement of the Customs has not been owing to the Smuggling Cutters, but to a Casualty. An artful Way this of attempting to invalidate a well known Fact. A Casualty is talked of, but no Casualty is explained; till that is clearly pointed out, the Public will continue to believe, as they do now, that the Smuggling Cutters *are of great Service*; and that they *really have increased the Customs*.

The Author next gets into a Puzzle about the Sinking Fund, which he just leaves as dark, intricate, and unintelligible as he found it. But, for Clearness sake, I will acquaint his Readers that the intended Meaning of his Wire-drawn Argument is, that the Sinking Fund cannot produce the 2,000,000 l. which the Minister has thought proper to take from it; although he himself has estimated the growing Produce, from *October* 1763, to *October* 1764, at 4,548,000 l. and it was proved, which he cannot deny, that the Sinking Fund has been increased this Year 391,000 l. by the Cutters. “ Here is a Syllogism for you ! ”

Such

Such an Absurdity deserves rather to be laughed at, than honoured with a serious Reply.

We next come to the winding up of the Whole ; which is nothing less than the most infamous Calumnly that ever was invented. After characterising the M——y as a Set of Traitors, he asserts a *Falsity*, of such a Nature, as can be equalled by nothing but his own Insolence and Malice, *viz.* that we had, at the Conclusion of the War, the Funds for two Years to come. Now it is notorious to all *England*, that, at the Time of the Peace, so distressed were the Government for Ways and Means to raise the Supplies, (former Ministers having exhausted all Resources) that they were necessitated to have Recourse to an *Excise* ; which the present Minister has the Honour to have carried into Execution, although his Predecessor had failed in so essential a Point. Would the Government have been necessitated to have Recourse to the *Excise*, if there had been the Funds for two Years to come?—A plain and direct *Fallacy* this. But the most extraordinary Assertion in this Paragraph is, “ That Advertisements went to the Enemy, that if they would “ hold their Breath but a few Hours, we would raise the “ Clamour for Peace here.” Who sent these Advertisements? The Writer of the BUDGET dare not name them; or if he durst, could not. But it is plain what he means by Advertisements, *viz.* *The Considerations on the German War*, which, as they were allowed to have unhinged *his Excellency of Hayes*, the Writer must never be forgiven for so seasonable and important a Piece of Service to his Country. But the Writer of the CONSIDERATIONS, I am persuaded, will rather think himself favoured by such low illiberal Petulancy, especially as it comes
from

from the same Hand which abuses the Servants of his Majesty, than judge it worthy of any Reply, or Defence of himself. A contemptuous Silence is the best Manner of treating such wretched Scribblers: Their Calumny and their Nonsense will die away of themselves; whereas, if they are honoured with any Reply, they will live, because of their Opponents.

There are a few other Lines of the BUDGET, which are just worthy of Notice, for the Sake of a Refutation, *viz.* A Kind of Bravado is held out, that the Minister cannot raise *next* Year's Supplies *also*, without laying additional taxes. Now I think, I can take upon me to assert, that in this the Writer of the BUDGET, and all his Party, will be greatly disappointed; for the Minister will next Year, notwithstanding all the Difficulties which it is intended to lay him under, raise the Supplies, whatever may be the Amount, without burdening his Majesty's Subjects. But methinks I hear the factious Club in *Albemarle-Street* cry out, "Stay! Stay! for we assert the Minister *must* lay new Taxes *next* Year." To which I reply, "Stay! Stay! and Time will confute ye."

F I N I S.